

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

Claims 1-11 are pending and under consideration.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY:

ON May 18, 2006, the undersigned Applicants' representative contacted the Examiner regarding the Objection to the Specification, and pointed out that pp. 31-20 to 31-25 of the priority document, which was incorporated by reference into the subject Specification, shows that the intended TiOPC," was "a-type TiOPC."

OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION:

In the Office Action, at page 2, the Examiner objects to the specification asserting that the Amendment filed February 22, 2006 introduces new matter. Applicants traverse the objection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Applicants respectfully submit that pp. 31-20 to 31-25 of the priority document, which was incorporated by reference into the subject Specification, shows that the intended TiOPC," was "a-type TiOPC." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Amendment filed February 22, 2006 did not introduce new matter.

As additional support for this position, Applicants herewith submit a verified translation of the priority document, which shows that the intended TiOPC," was "a-type TiOPC." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Amendment filed February 22, 2006 did not introduce new matter.

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION:

In the Office Action, at page 3, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-7, and 11 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7, 8, 20, 21, 26, and 29 of copending Application No. 10/964,740, for the reasons set forth therein. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 3, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 8-10 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7, 8, 20, 21, 26, and 29 of copending Application No. 10/964,740 in view of Handbook of Imaging

Materials 2nd edition to Diamond et al. pp. 381-2, for the reasons set forth therein. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Applicants have timely filed a Terminal Disclaimer in Application No. 10/964,740 with respect to the subject application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the double patenting rejection is overcome.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 24 July 2006

By: Michael A. Bush
Michael A. Bush
Registration No. 48,893

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501